

---

## Chapter 6

# Next Steps

The previous chapters of this *Alternatives/Options Report* outline the program options and components for further analysis and discussion by King County and MWPAAC agencies in 2005. This report, along with the *Regional Needs Assessment Report*, were called for in RWSP Policy I/IP-2.3. The County and local agencies will use these reports as a basis for narrowing the options and program components presented here to one preferred program alternative that the Executive will submit to the King County Council by December 31, 2005. This chapter outlines the necessary next steps in the decision making process, including specific analyses, reviews, and meetings that must take place leading up to the selection of a preferred program alternative and its submittal to the Council in December 2005.

## 6.1 Regional Needs Assessment Report

The *Regional Needs Assessment Report* defines the levels of I/I within local agency collection systems and identifies the updated conveyance facility needs based on the recent flow monitoring conducted for the I/I program.

The *Regional Needs Assessment Report* is a product of several components, including flow-monitoring data that feeds into the MOUSE<sup>TM</sup> hydrologic and conveyance system hydraulics models to generate the future flow information and projected capacity needs for all portions of the regional conveyance system. Identification of the conveyance facility improvement needs, as well as their proposed timing, location, and estimated costs provide the basis for the I/I cost-effectiveness analysis that will follow.

The full *Regional Needs Assessment Report* is being submitted to Council along with this *Alternatives/Options Report*.

## 6.2 Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Once future regional conveyance system capacity needs are identified and costs are estimated, a separate cost model will be used to estimate the costs of I/I reduction projects upstream of identified conveyance improvement projects. The cost model will use planning assumptions developed jointly by the County and local agencies, including assumed costs of specific I/I reduction methods, assumed reduction effectiveness percentages, contingency and other factors. The costs of conveyance system improvements will be compared with the estimated I/I reduction costs to arrive at the cost-effectiveness comparison on a project specific basis.

From this analysis, a list of cost-effective I/I projects will be identified along with their timing and locations. Once the list of cost-effective I/I projects and their associated cost savings from

the existing Conveyance System Improvements (CSI) budget are known, it will be possible for the County and local agencies to make informed decisions as they narrow in on a preferred program alternative. The cost-effectiveness analysis is being completed on a parallel track with the *Alternatives/Options Report* and will be complete in the second quarter of 2005. As the information from this analysis becomes available, it will be presented to the E&P Subcommittee for their review and input.

### 6.3 Financial Feasibility Analysis of a 30-Percent I/I Reduction Goal

The RWSP states that the overall goal for peak I/I reduction in the service area should be 30 percent from the peak 20-year level identified in the *Regional Needs Assessment Report*. By June 2005, a list of “least-cost” projects required to meet the 30-percent goal regionally will be prepared and presented to the E&P Subcommittee for their consideration. This list will be derived from the same information and assumptions used for the cost-effectiveness analysis and will include cost estimates, timing, location, and impacts to regional facilities of I/I reduction projects. The list of projects and associated costs necessary to reach a 30-percent reduction goal will be discussed with the E&P Subcommittee and will inform the decisions to be made about the cost-effectiveness of achieving the 30-percent I/I reduction goal.

### 6.4 Analysis of a Regulatory Approach: Thresholds, Surcharges, and Monitoring Requirements

Another potential program component discussed in this report is a regulatory approach, including possible maximum I/I thresholds or sewer surcharges. A regulatory component could be added to any program alternative, or a regulatory approach could be a central program driver (as described in Alternative 4). This potential program component must be analyzed further to determine how an appropriate surcharge would be structured. Any threshold level will need to be set and evaluated in terms of cost to local agencies and benefit to the regional system and future capacity needs. A threshold approach would require a monitoring and enforcement program. This monitoring and enforcement program would have an administrative structure and cost to the County and local agencies that would need to be further analyzed. The County will work with the E&P Subcommittee to develop and discuss possible threshold levels and analyze the associated costs and system impacts, while working toward consensus on whether to include a regulatory component in the overall long-term I/I control program.

## 6.5 Further Analysis of Private Property I/I Program Options

As discussed in Chapter 3 of this report, I/I flows originating on private property contribute a majority of I/I to the regional collection and treatment system. Thus, a long-term regional I/I control program must include approaches to rehabilitating I/I sources on private property. Three possible approaches could be pursued independently or in some combination. They include a regulatory program; a loan-based program; and a directly funded program in which the County or local agencies pay for I/I repairs on private property without requiring the property owner to pay back the agency.

A directly funded program could provide important advantages, allowing the County or local agencies to target I/I reduction in a particular basin upstream of a needed conveyance improvement project. By directly funding I/I projects, the participation of private property owners could be maximized, and most importantly, rehabilitation work could be done according to the schedule necessary to reduce I/I flows prior to the needed construction start date on a CSI project.

An analysis of all three approaches has been initiated; preliminary findings indicate they all could be feasible. Further analysis of the three possible approaches for reducing I/I flows from private property will continue in 2005. This further analysis will inform the County and local agencies as they jointly work toward a recommended program approach.

## 6.6 Immediate Next Steps

King County staff and the MWPAAC E&P Subcommittee will hold regular meetings as needed to discuss the topics outlined above and move toward consensus on a preferred program alternative and its various components. Meetings will take place from March through September 2005, when a final program recommendation will be developed. The Executive will submit the preferred program to the Council by December 31, 2005.